
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 2:24-cv-01996-JLS-JC

Date: May 24, 2024

Title: Dorian Kingi, et al. v. SAG-AFTRA, et al.

Present: **Honorable JOSEPHINE L. STATON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

Charles A. Rojas
Deputy Clerk

N/A
Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendant:

Not Present

Not Present

**PROCEEDINGS: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
REMAND (Doc. 18)**

Before the Court is a Motion to Remand filed by all Plaintiffs in this consolidated action. The Motions and Oppositions were originally filed in all 40 related cases, before the Court consolidated the actions. (*See, e.g.,* Mot. in *Kingi v. SAG-AFTRA*, Doc. 18.; Opp. in *Kingi v. SAG-AFTRA*, Doc. 21.) The Court then consolidated the actions and explained that, since all 40 Motions to Remand were largely identical and raised the same arguments, it would rule on the question of remand under the consolidated case caption. (*See* Consolidation Order at 5–6, Doc. 24.) Plaintiffs filed a consolidated Reply. (Reply, Doc. 26.) Having taken the matter under submission, the Court now DENIES the Motion to Remand.

Plaintiffs concede that their complaints “include [a] Federal Question cause of action,” because Plaintiffs brought a claim for breach of the contractual duty of fair representation under the National Labor Relations Act. (Mot. at 7, 9.) Therefore, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367, this Court has supplemental jurisdiction “over all other claims that are so related to claims in the action ... that they form part of the same case or controversy.” This supplemental jurisdiction extends to all state law claims Plaintiffs bring, as Plaintiffs do not argue that those state law claims are unrelated to the federal claim. Rather, Plaintiffs ask the Court, in its discretion, to sever the state law claims and

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 2:24-cv-01996-JLS-JC

Date: May 24, 2024

Title: Dorian Kingi, et al. v. SAG-AFTRA, et al.

remand them to state court. (Mot. at 12–13); *see also Campos v. Fresno Deputy Sheriff's Ass'n*, 535 F. Supp. 3d 913, 928 (E.D. Cal. 2021) (“Courts have broad discretion in determining whether to sever claims or parties.” (citing *In re EMC Corp.*, 677 F.3d 1351, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2012))). Plaintiffs argue in a single, conclusory sentence that “prejudice to Plaintiff[s] would be avoided if severed because this court could focus upon the ... [duty of fair representation] claims solely.” (Mot. at 13.)

This does not persuade the Court. The state law claims are part of the same case and controversy, and prompt and efficient disposition of the litigation weighs against severance. The Motion to Remand is DENIED.

The Court ORDERS Plaintiffs to file an amended, consolidated complaint under the consolidated caption, *Kingi, et al. v. SAG-AFTRA*. Plaintiffs shall file the consolidated complaint within **fourteen (14) days** of the issuance of this Order.

Initials of Deputy Clerk: cr